

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MATTHEW BECKER, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TIG INSURANCE CO., et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:21-cv-05185-JHC

ORDER


This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion to Enter Amended Motions In Limine. Dkt. # 129. The Court has considered the motion and the materials filed in support of the motion. The motion is noted for tomorrow, but no defendant has filed a response, and the matter is ready for resolution. Being fully advised, the Court rules as follows:

For the most part, Plaintiffs' draft amended motions in limine raise the same issues presented in their prior motions in limine, and the Court has already ruled on those motions. Dkt. # 149. Further, new materials submitted by Plaintiffs would not persuade the Court to rule differently than before. To the extent the motion raises the same issues as raised before, it is moot.

1 The draft amended motions in limine do contain one motion that was not raised in  
2 Plaintiffs' prior motions. *See* Dkt. # 129-10 at 21 ("22. Any evidence, argument, inference, or  
3 suggestion by TIG that any of its deficiencies, errors, or failures to fulfill any of its duties were  
4 the fault of or responsibility of Gillaspay & Rhodes."); *compare* Dkts. ## 116–20, *with* Dkt. #  
5 129-10. Had Plaintiffs timely submitted this particular motion in limine, the Court would have  
6 denied it without prejudice. Should this issue arise at trial, Plaintiffs may renew their objection  
7 at that time.

8 For these reasons, the Court DENIES the motion.

9 Dated this 12th day of January, 2023.

10   
11 John H. Chun  
12 United States District Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24